THE STATE OF UTAH

OFFICE OF STATE ENGINEER

SALT LAKE CITY

July 16, 1937

REL: COAL CREEK DISTRIBUTION

T. H. HUMPHERYS
STATE ENGINEER

Memorandum for Office Study only, by F. W. COTTRELL

On July 15, while in Cedar City, Mr. J. L. Hornbuckle, on noticing the State Engineer's seal on the automobile being used, asked that I visit the old flour mill approximately one mile above Cedar City, the water right for which, he and others had purchased for the purpose of operating a plaster mill.

The mill was visited in company with Mr. Hornbuckle, and Mr. S. W. Leigh, the record owner of the property, and an examination of the conditions were made. According to Mr. Hornbuckle's statement, he and his associates are purchasing from S. W. Leigh the present owner, the old mill, and the water right decreed in the Coal creek decree to the Cedar Milling Company. This right is mentioned under the Coal Greek Decree on page 8.

Prior to one year ago, the West Field Irrigation Company and Cedar City Corporation, diverted water from Coal creek at a point opposite and slightly below the point of return of the water from the old mill. Apparently, this diversion has been difficult to maintain on account of the deep channel filled with large boulders. During high water and flood periods the diverting dam has in the past been carried away. Approximately one year ago the West Field Irrigation Company without making Application for change of point of diversion in this office, diverted the water from Coal creek into the old diversion canal of West Field Irrigation Co., approximately 700 or 800 ft. upstream from the point of return of the mill water. Diversion at the latter point can be better maintained than where the water was formerly diverted at the old mill. The owners of the old mill right contend that their right is still good, and that they expect to divert the water to generate power for milling purposes as formerly. To this, it is claimed the West Field Irrigation Co. objects.

Mr. E. W. Leigh, a member of the Board of Directors of the West Field Irrigation Co., was contacted by phone and asked for his objections to this procedure. I was informed the West Field Irrigation Co. had encouragement from this office approximately two years ago to effect the change of the point of diversion, and did not deem it necessary to apply to this office for a change of the point of diversion. The said Irrigation Company contend the mill right was abandoned.

Application for It appears the West Field Irrigation Company having filed no/change

on July 11, while it leder Oit, Mr. .1. Hornbackle, on no ledther that the start most, what the trait of the start and the start will be start with the start will be start that the start

The fills a visited in course, with a file course is, and the strainsting of the conditions led the conditions were proved a successful to a strainment, so in Him Especiates and the west and conditions of the west and the conditions of the west and the conditions of the conditions of the conditions and the conditions of the conditions o

-inerpool lin ble for correction of the selection of his belief by .v. this diversion has been difficult to maintained need int of the deeployingnel filled with le ve boularre. Buring him water and filled of obligation

diversion could be wet Field Irrigation Co. . Persimately 700 of 200 Kt. upstream from the poly of teture of the mill meter. Diver doubt to the or to the point of the case recommend of the period of the period of the 6/2Irrigation Company could be supported. appears this would have to be established before contention of the West Field is a question as to whether or not they have forfeited the right by nonuse. It

It appears the right has been decreed to the Milling Company and there

fore they can insist the water be turned into the present diversion. ing Company has no rights, and to ask for a change of the point of diversion be-It appears it is then up to the West Field Irrigation Co. to show that the Millmissioner is willing to turn the water to him any time he requests the same. in the South Field Irrigation canal. Mr. Hornbuckle states that the Water Comof the point of diversion, has no right to insist upon the water being changed

Coal Creek Districution 42/9T/4